



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,745	02/26/2001	Teppo Kojo	989.1026	9912

21831            7590            01/14/2003

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.  
1140 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS, 15th FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10036-5803

EXAMINER

RIVERA, WILLIAM ARAUZ

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3654

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/763,745	KOJO ET AL.
	Examiner William A Rivera	Art Unit 3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 1-6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 is vague and indefinite. On lines 7-8, the phrase “corresponding substantially to the production width of the paper is reeled in a second reel-up” is unclear because it is not known what step is being set forth. What “corresponds” with the production width and what is reeled up?

Claim 2 is vague and indefinite. How does this claim further limit the method steps set forth in Claim 1? Note that what is claimed here appears to be identical to the last two lines of Claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchante (U.S. Patent No. 6,371,399) in view of Gay et al (U.S. Patent No. 2,092,966).

With respect to Claims 1-16 Marchante, Figures 1-5, teaches providing a full-width paper web issuing from a paper machine 19 having a production width, and reeling said full-width paper web in a first reel-up 1. Gay et al, Figures 1-6, teach unwinding a paper web 2; passing the

Art Unit: 3654

web through a finishing machine 3 and reeled up in a second reel-up 7 wherein the first reel arranged between the paper machine and the unwinding station has a different dimension than the second reel spool. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to send the first reeled up web to an unwinding station, as taught by Gay et al, for the purpose of further treating the web. Further it should be noted that it is well known in the art to move rolls to different areas for further handling. Therefore It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a roll such as that of Marchante could be moved to be finished by the method shown by Gay et al.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William A. Rivera whose telephone number is (703) 308-2684. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 2:00 PM to 10:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathy Matecki, can be reached on (703) 308-2688.

Telephone status inquiries regarding this application should be directed to (703) 308-1113. **Facsimile correspondence** for this application should be sent to the following respective numbers:

For **BEFORE FINAL** correspondence: (703) 872-9326  
For **AFTER FINAL** correspondence: (703) 872-9327



WILLIAM A. RIVERA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 13, 2003